DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 227 853 IR 050 148

AUTHOR Trochim, Mary Kane
TITLE Academic Library Resource Sharing through Bibliographic Utility Program Participation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.; Office of Libraries and Learning Technologies (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Aug 82
NOTE 86p.; For related document, see IR 050 149.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Higher Education; *Information Networks; *Interlibrary Loans; Library Automation; Library Collections; Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Library Technical Processes; *Online Systems; Research Libraries; Shared Services
IDENTIFIERS *Bibliographic Utilities; OCLC; Research Libraries Information Network; Washington Library Network

ABSTRACT

Information on the growth of bibliographic utilities and academic library networking is presented in this report, as well as profiles of interlibrary loan activity at six academic libraries who are members of a major bibliographic utility. Applications of computer technology and network participation in academic libraries, and the major events in the development of computer-assisted library cooperation are discussed. A description of the major bibliographic utilities includes OCLC, the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN), and the Washington Library Network (WLN). The Council on Library Resources' project to devise a standard telecommunications protocol for bibliographic information exchange among RLIN, OCLC, and the Library of Congress (LC) is also briefly described. A review of interlibrary loan programs provided by OCLC and RLIN precedes individual reports on interlibrary lending at Indiana State University (Terre Haute, IN); Cornell University (Ithaca, NY); Lake Forest College (Chicago, IL); George Washington University (Washington, DC); St. Olaf College (Northfield, MN); and Ithaca College (Ithaca, NY). Statistics on individual library holdings and interlending activities are provided, together with a summary list of similarities and differences in the interlending practices of the six libraries. A consideration of issues for the future, particularly in regard to a national network of libraries, and a 44-item bibliography conclude the report. (ESR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
• This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
□ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

IR

ED227853

ACADEMIC LIBRARY RESOURCE SHARING THROUGH BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITY PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

REPORT TO THE OFFICE OF LIBRARIES AND LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES
IN FULFILLMENT OF ORDER NUMBER 370-81-3658

BY
MARY KANE TROCHIM
LIBRARY MANAGEMENT CONSULTANT, ITHACA, NEW YORK
AUGUST, 1982

Prepared for the United States Department of Education,
Office of Educational Research and Improvement,
Office of LIbraries and Learning Technologies.
(The contents of this paper do not necessarily reflect
the views or policies of the Department of Education.)

IR050148

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....1

SOME APPLICATIONS OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY.....3

EVENTS IN COMPUTER-ASSISTED LIBRARY COOPERATION.....6
- OCLC
- RLG/RLIN
- Center for Research Libraries
- WLN
- University-developed Systems
- Circulation Systems

THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES.....11
- OCLC
- RLG, Inc.
- WLN

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND THE UTILITIES.....19
- OCLC
  - Searching and Verification
  - ILL Subsystem
- RLG/RLIN
  - Shared Resources Program
  - ILL Message Subsystem
  - ILL Subsystem

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AT SELECTED LIBRARIES.....24
- Background
- Indiana State University.....28
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- Cornell University.....37
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- Lake Forest College.....45
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- George Washington University.....53
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- St. Olaf College.....60
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- Ithaca College.....65
  - General Description
  - Interlibrary Loan
- Summary.....72

ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE.....74

NOTES.....78

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....81

INTRODUCTION

America's college and university libraries collectively foster a strong tradition of creative response to the information and research needs of their users. Before the advent of regional machine-linked networks during the early 1960's, academic libraries of all sizes participated in resource sharing through both formal and informal channels, recognizing, even in an era of adequate funding for academic programs, that no single library could fill the needs of its population. The concept of interlibrary lending, especially among libraries in the same geographic area, was a logical extension of good library service. And the expansion of this concept to include even better access to even more material is one of the major reasons for the remarkable development over the past two decades of regional telecommunications networks and the growth of the major bibliographic utilities.

The entrance of the library world into the computer age occurred at a fortuitous time. Simultaneous with the information explosion generated by the growth in scientific and technical research, the cost of virtually all library goods and services began its still-ascending trend during the 1960's. Academic librarians contributed a vast amount of time, knowledge and effort to the development of the networks and bibliographic systems which currently form the foundation of effective library service. Groups of academic libraries joined together in a variety of configurations to build broader resource and information sharing

systems based in part on the traditional success of interlibrary lending as a cooperative program.

"Before online systems came to the library world in 1971, there were numerous library consortia and cooperatives in every region of the country, but few had any significant record of accomplishment."[1] The increasing feasibility of applying technology to enhance academic library operations strengthened and imposed direction upon the existing consortia, and prompted the development of many more.

The distribution by the Library of Congress of their MARC (Machine Readable Cataloging) records for use as the recipients of the tapes saw fit prompted a flurry of experimentation and development. "...at least two groups of libraries saw in the availability of the MARC tapes an opportunity to work cooperatively in the application of emerging on-line automated systems to a broad range of library programs."[2] The Ohio College Association, which had been developing a program of cooperative purchasing and lending for almost a decade, was one of these, and in 1967 formed the Ohio College Library Center (OCLC) whose primary goal was to develop a computerized sharable on-line bibliographic data base to increase productivity and decrease the costs of processing for its members. A milestone in shared resource development was the decision by other regional consortia and networks such as the New England Library Network, the Pennsylvania Library Network, The Southern Library Network and the AMIGOS Bibliogaphic Council of the southwestern U. S. to contract with OCLC for its services, thus strengthening the

philosophy of cooperation among libraries from various regions, obviating the necessity for parallel and almost certainly redundant technological program development, and freeing the resources of the regional groups for the development of local training and support programs. It was thus that the de facto "networks" which began with interlibrary lending agreements developed into high-technology shared-access hierarchical systems.

SOME APPLICATIONS OF COMPUTER TECHNOLOGY AND NETWORK PARTICIPATION IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES

Since the advent of computer technology and resource sharing networks, the character of academic libraries has changed dramatically. No longer merely a haven for booklovers, the academic library is now steeped in high technology to augment virtually every aspect of its program.

The area of technical services was the first to feel the effects of the telecommunications age. Facilitating the cataloging function was the first purpose of the networks and utilities; to that end OCLC, and later RLIN (Research Libraries Group/ Research Libraries Information Network), developed highly sophisticated programs for shared data input and record production for participating libraries. Access to the existing records of other institutions reduces duplication of cataloging effort to a great extent, allows for the reconfiguration of staff and budget use, and provides some standardization of original cataloging across libraries. The online bibliographic databases

which result from cooperative input have been used to develop local and regional research and interlibrary loan tools and have served as the basis for retrospective conversion of academic libraries' catalogs.

The development of online computerized acquisitions systems over the past few years by regional and larger utilities and by commercial vendors helped to simplify a costly and complex technical process. In addition, the ability to link acquisitions records to the cataloging process created, at least in theory, a transaction history for each item from its ordering to its successful cataloging. The complex task of linking commercial suppliers with the bibliographic data base center, and each user library to both, seems to another technological challenge successfully met.

Traditional public services, although unchanged in their philosophy of patron service, have moved into the computer age with the development and installation of automated circulation systems, many of which have interfacing capabilities with the bibliographic data bases. Automated circulation systems are being developed by networks, bibliographic utilities, universities and vendors, so that a variety of configurations exists. The interfacing capability of most of the healthy systems bodes well for continued cooperative development. The circulation networks created by some of these systems have been a boon to interlibrary loan programs in affected areas; but one of the most important aspects of bibliographic data base participation has been the informal use of the data base for searching and verifying the

locations of needed items. The bibliographic utilities recognize the prevalent use of the online data bases for interlibrary loan, and have created special subsystems to enhance that function.

The effects of computer-enhanced library services and programs on the management of academic libraries are largely positive, but it is evident that commitment and acceptance of some lack of autonomy are necessary. Decisions by academic library administrations to participate in the programs of regional networks and/or bibliographic utilities have met with general success in the past; librarians are more willing to view their libraries as a single important entity in a larger system whose resources permit the development of programs not possible on the individual library level. Active participation in a network requires, and fosters, a review of administrative priorities in terms of personnel and budget allocation and collection development. Personnel issues which arise include the increased importance of staff training and development to make optimum use of the network's enhancements as they occur, and the consideration of staffing reconfiguration to make the most of both staff and system capabilities. The budget choices imposed upon academic library administrators are probably the most difficult; even with evidence of demonstrated success in resource sharing, the decision to support user groups and bibliographic utilities with limited library funds raise some questions both within the library administration and outside it. The effective application of cooperative bibliographic programs at the local level can greatly enhance the library's position on campus.

MAJOR EVENTS IN COMPUTER-ASSISTED LIBRARY COOPERATION AND THEIR APPLICATION TO INTERLIBRARY LOAN

The development and release by the Library of Congress of the MARC data base tapes in 1968 effectively signalled the beginning of shared cataloging; libraries began to experiment with ways to use the cataloging data. An early experiment at the Yale Medical Library which was developed and conducted by Frederick Kilgour was installed as a prototype card production system. The Yale Bibliographic System was ultimately outmoded by the rapid refinements made in subsequent MARC formats, but did serve as a model for subsequent card production systems.

Another creative manipulation of the MARC records led to the foundation of OCLC, as noted previously. With the installation of the online bibliographic data base at OCLC, manipulation of machine records to produce cards for a local library's catalog was possible, and the database became a source of online information concerning the holdings of other library collections. During the intervening years, improved access to holdings information has become a major goal of academic libraries, and is encouraged by the service centers/networks which form the foundation of the OCLC hierarchical system. As the OCLC bibliographic data base grows, library cooperatives and special interest groups devise a variety of database manipulations to create customized data bases. Some examples: the building of the CONSER (Library of Congress Conservation of Serials project) data file was undertaken to provide a shared, readily accessible

serial data base for participating libraries. Specially produced tools such as the NYSILL (New York State Interlibrary Loan system) attempted to provide up-to-date holdings information in hardcopy format.

With the installation of its Interlibrary Loan Subsystem, OCLC ushered in a new generation of interlibrary loan program development. No longer dependent upon the mail or obsolescent teletype units, the system converts OCLC terminals into message switching devices, allowing libraries to place requests and respond to requests online.

The importance of the regional and state networks in OCLC's programs of shared resources cannot be overestimated. Networks and cooperatives provided, and still provide, the channels through which OCLC reaches its members. In addition, "these networks provide various services, including orientation and continued training for their members, the facilitation of implementation and start-up, and support for fiscal and legal relationships with the utility."[3]

Cooperation through shared information and collections was the purpose of the Research Libraries Group (RLG) at its inception in 1974. It has since grown to include the Research Libraries Information Network (RLIN, formerly BALLOTS) which provides RLG member/owners with online access to the RLG cooperative bibliographic data base. The impact of the expanding bibliographic data base upon local book selection activities has been one of the major interests of the RLG, which publicly acknowledges the special interdependence of research libraries

and the necessity of applying available resources to address the problems of individual research libraries. For these reasons, the successful implementation of an online interlibrary loan system among RLG member/owners is critical. Although the ultimate system, which will allow libraries to capture bibliographic data from the RLIN data base, will be installed during the summer of 1982, the RLG/RLIN message system has served adequately as an interim interlibrary loan switching service.

The Center for Research Libraries (CRL) is one of the most venerable of the cooperative acquisitions ventures. Begun shortly after World War II as the Midwest Interlibrary Resource Center, CRL expanded its sphere of cooperation by inviting membership from all over the country. The concept of cooperative collection development is an important CRL goal as well: the Center decides upon the purchase of suggested acquisitions by taking into account the availability of the requested item at other libraries and the interlibrary lending policies at those libraries, in addition to the wishes of the membership.

The Washington State Library is responsible for the forward-looking approach to bibliographic access as evidenced by the success of the Washington Library Network. WLN, originally developed for use within Washington state only, has as a special attraction a subject authority file which is fully integrated with the bibliographic holdings of the member libraries. The excellence of the data base has prompted wider membership and discussions regarding cooperative programs with other library networks.

University libraries all over the country (and beyond) have been leaders in the development of data bases to serve the needs of their users and to expand that service to libraries in the same area. Systems with permanent applicability and value were designed and implemented at the University of Chicago and Stanford University, for example. And the University of Toronto's Library (UTLAS) Automation System is currently considered one of the major developments in bibliographic utility enhancement.

Automated circulation systems were among the first data bases attempted at some university libraries; two notable successes were Northwestern University's automated circulation system and the University of Illinois Library Computer System (LCS). The University of Illinois system has developed into much more than a shared data base, since it has become a significant replacement for past interlibrary loan practices within the state. The development and marketing of the circulation control system by the University of Guelph, which has since become Geac Ltd., has answered the special circulation needs of college and university libraries throughout the U.S. and Canada, and interfacing capability with other automated systems is being explored. Commercial vendors of circulation systems such as CL Systems (formerly CLSI) and Dataphase Inc., help libraries in the same area or of the same type develop networks of interlibrary cooperation, which serve as local or regional interlibrary loan networks.

At the same time that these and many other systems were

being developed, computer literacy in virtually every field was growing dramatically. Increased familiarity with computer and telecommunications technology bred in both librarians and their users increased expectations of the computer's capabilities. It seems fortunate that, given the adhoc and local nature of most computer-assisted library programs and services, the resulting de facto networks offer and support systems which are pertinent and practical for academic libraries.

THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC UTILITIES

Bibliographic utilities, systems which have grown from local or regional networks to national multi-program services, are the entities that are currently the foundation of virtually all computer-assisted cooperative programs in the U.S. The major bibliographic utilities at present are the OCLC (now called the Online Computer Library Center) and RLG Inc., whose RLIN (Research Libraries Information Network) is the basis for its cooperative development programs. In addition, the Washington Library Network and the University of Toronto Library Automated System are usually considered utilities which also have potential nationwide application.

The question of the development of several large utilities to serve the online bibliographic needs of the nation's libraries, rather than the growth of a single authority often arises in discussions about the bibliographic utilities, the regional networks and the so-called national network. The reasons for the existence of several utilities are inherent in the nature of traditional U.S. library development. The bibliographic utilities were begun to serve local or regional clientele, and developed along geographic lines, rather than across regions. The systems began at approximately the same time, and their goals were more limited in scope. Support for the bibliographic utilities was modest at the outset. In addition, the utilities have made maximum use of telecommunications technology as it

becomes available; systems to support a nationwide single bibliographic service center have not been available in the past.[4] This "bottom-up" approach is a characteristic of library cooperative planning in the last two decades.

Common characteristics of the bibliographic utilities include the development and maintenance by each center of a large-scale bibliographic data base in machine-readable form and accessible through network systems; the centralized processing of products (such as catalog cards) for participating libraries; and research and development of additional programs and services to make the greatest use of the existing data base.

OCLC is by far the largest and most diverse of the bibliographic utlities at present. From its beginnings in the late 1960's as a consortium of Ohio college libraries, OCLC has grown to serve 6,000 libraries directly or indirectly, with 20 regional centers and two processing/service centers. During the year 1980-81, 14 million books were cataloged, 1 million new titles were added to the OCLC data base, and 112 million cards were printed for distribution to user libraries. In addition, 940,000 interlibrary loans were channeled through the interlibrary loan (ILL) subsystem direct from one library to another, and 35 million records were supplied on tape for local use.[5] OCLC programs and services include shared online cataloging, automated acquisitions, the distribution of archival tapes for local or group use, and direct interlibrary loan between member libraries.

The major strength of the OCLC system is its configuration

of regional network service points which have in the past supplied local libraries with OCLC services, provided training and development to the staff of local libraries, acted as a channel for OCLC/library financial arrangements, and provided the logical regional vehicle for interlibrary loan using OCLC's database as a primary searching tool. Also, "Several service center networks have begun planning and development activities for a variety of on-line and batch network services including: the merging of member library tapes to form regional services such as a union catalog; conversion of catalog tapes to circulation files; the loading of the cataloging, circulation and conversion tapes from member libraries into a regional on-line catalog with subject searching; local and regional authority files; and interlibrary loan and reference searching."[6] The largely mutual benefit derived from OCLC's relationship with the regional networks is evident in the above applications of OCLC's data base and services to regional problem-solving.

The membership of OCLC reflects its beginnings as an academic library consortium: 53% of the participating libraries are college or university libraries, 16% are public libraries; special libraries comprise 7% of the members, 11.8% are federal government libraries, 1.2% are state government libraries, and 5% are libraries operating for profit.[7]

Recent OCLC planning and activity suggest that the bibliographic utility is building upon its past success by offering integrated processing systems to libraries, thus enhancing OCLC' attractiveness to potential and current users.

The "enhanced circulation system" devised by the Claremont Colleges is now the Total Library System (TLS), undergoing refinement as OCLC's inhouse circulation system. The newly developed Local Library System includes circulation, interlibrary loan, acquisitions, cataloging, serials control, and administrative control for individual libraries, seemingly the ideal integrated online system.

At the same time that these major program developments are taking place, OCLC is focusing much attention on its relationships with its participants, both as individual libraries and as members of the service networks. According to Philip Schieber, Director of Public Relations at OCLC, OCLC recognizes the importance of ensuring that "OCLC members get at least acceptable service, and are currently trying to strengthen relationships with the networks while at the same time respecting their independence."[8]

With the purpose of broadening its membership base, OCLC proposed in February 1982 a new user status system which permits the use of OCLC non-cataloging subsystems by libraries other than full participants. New categories of participants proposed by OCLC are those of Special User and Partial User. A Special User library is one which "uses the online system but does not qualify as a participant."[9] A Partial User library is one that "elects not to contribute its Roman alphabet cataloging to the OCLC data base but uses any of OCLC's non-cataloging systems."[10] The new user status configuration has met with general approval. The other major bibliographic utility is RLG Inc., whose

Research Libraries Information Network forms the basis for cooperative collection development in 27 of the major U.S. research libraries. The composition and purposes of RLG differ significantly from those of OCLC: RLG began in 1974 as a small consortium of Northeastern research libraries (the first members were the libraries of Yale University, Harvard University, Columbia University and the Research Libraries of The New York Public Library) and instituted programs aimed at answering the special needs of research institutions, whereas the goals of OCLC were broader in scope for wider applicability across all types of libraries. Early programs instituted by RLG included a shared resources program of priority lending among members and a cooperative serials acquisitions program. Support for the fledgling RLG came from private foundations, supplemented by membership dues.

With the decision in 1978 to adopt Stanford University's BALLOTS online bibliographic system to serve the needs of the RLG membership, the character of RLG as a consortium changed dramatically. The consortium continued to concentrate on programs to address research libraries' concerns including preservation of valuable material, the cooperative purchase of special collections, and shared access to unique research tools. At the same time RLG/RLIN entered the arena of competitive telecommunications technology. The attraction for larger research libraries was inevitable, as RLG abandoned "OCLC's notion of a 'melting pot' database and broad customer base. In contrast to OCLC, RLG draws from a selective group of research libraries

across the U.S."[11] The exodus of several large research libraries from OCLC was a major cause of concern in terms of the quality of the OCLC data base because of the specialized and unique nature of many of the research collections, but the OCLC's new user status categories may obviate that concern. The data base which RLG's 27 member/owners, in addition to a variety of special and affiliated libraries, can access contains 5.022 million book records, and 907,000 serial title records. The authority file, based upon New York Public Library's records, consists of 2.032 million records. The RLIN data base can also be accessed by non-member "search-only" participants, most of which are California institutions who contract through the California Authority for Library Systems and Services (CLASS) for use of the system. CLASS is one of three networks having affiliations with RLG; the others are the Bibliographic Center for Research (BCR) and the Washington Library Network. WLN's role in relation to RLG differs from the others by virtue of its own data base sharing capabilities.

The Washington Library Network is also a system which owes its beginnings to the Library of Congress' release of the MARC I tapes in the late 1960's, when it developed a union catalog for three libraries under the auspices of the Washington State Library. WLN currently has over forty members, half of whom are academic libraries, and is very active in establishing cooperative agreements with other networks, large and small. In 1979 RLG and WLN agreed to develop a multi-network database; the first activity involved the sharing of authority files between

the two databases.

The most important cooperative development agreement among the utilities, however, is the mutual decision by RLG, OCLC, WLN and the Library of Congress to develop a telecommunication protocol which would facilitate the exchange of bibliographic information among systems.[12] This cooperative agreement has as its basis the 1979 decision by WLN and RLG to merge authority files to develop telecommunications capabilities and link the two computers directly. The project is funded by the Council on Library Resources, and is considered to be "a first step in bringing together already existing pieces of a network which is referred to as 'the emerging national network'."[13]

The desirability of developing methods to link the major utilities has long been obvious, and inclusion of the Library of Congress as the major authority data supplier greatly expands the usefulness of such a link. The bibliographic utilities find themselves to some degree in the same position as their members do: by agreeing to develop mutually useful vehicles for communication and programs to enhance system capabilities, some difficult decisions concerning authority and autonomy must be made. These decisions concern the willingness of the utilities to devise appropriate and mutually beneficial programs drawing upon the strengths of the various systems, and the probable levels of each utility's involvement in the telecommunications protocol development. In terms of the latter, for example, OCLC has not stated its intent to share its bibliographic records through the proposed links. RLG, WLN, and the LC have agreed to

use the forthcoming protocol for possible linking of their data bases, thus creating an expanded base of records accessible to the memberships of the cooperating utilities. A "national network" of shared telecommunication systems seems the next logical step, provided that each utility agrees to its appropriateness.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AND THE UTILITIES

From the library user's view, interlibrary loan is the main reason for the development of the utilities' huge data bases and the technical hardware and expertise which support them. The networks and utilities recognize the success of their interlibrary loan programs and systems as an accurate test of their general success, and stress the importance of participation in interlibrary loan in several ways. "Washington participants in WLN sign a 'Memorandum of Agreement' committing them to participate in interlibrary loan, thus ensuring the availability of most held items."[14] At RLG, "there are a set of policies that pertain to ILL activity among RLIN members. They include the agreement to give priority treatment to ILL requests from other RLG members."[15] OCLC's new system enhancements and the supporting documentation and assistance provided to users encourage use of the system.

Although OCLC's ILL subsystem was installed during the spring of 1979, an informal OCLC ILL "system" had been in operation since the development of the online data base searching capability. The data base became an additional verification tool for ILL requests, which were then either sent by mail on ALA forms, or transmitted via teletype. In 1977, for example, 96% of OCLC's charter members used OCLC to verify ILL requests for locations, and 59% of this group search all book requests through OCLC before searching elsewhere.[16]

Many institutions installed OCLC terminals for the express purpose of facilitating interlibrary loans for their patrons. The availability of multiple holdings records seemed to foster new patterns in requesting material: "Small libraries (previously) presumably filled most of their ILL requests within the state prior to OCLC, while the larger libraries frequently relied on out-of-state libraries. It appears that...a noticeable reduction in the frequency of going out of state has occurred. This phenomenon is indicative of the collective strength of the holdings of smaller libraries in the system..."[17]

The advent of the Interlibrary Loan Subsystem in May 1979 created great anticipation; it seems that its users were not to be disappointed. The system "provides users with immediate access to the OCLC On-Line Union Catalog, the ILL Transaction File, and the ILL Message Waiting."[18] Some of the attractive features include the queueing capability, where a request is automatically routed to a designated list of libraries until it is filled (or not). Information on the item requested can be automatically retrieved from the data base, or can be input online if no records for the item exist.

In keeping with OCLC's "ultimate goal (of) full on-line access to all elements and location data for all participating institutions"[19] the utility has added subprograms to the systems which make it increasingly attractive to users; interfacing with the OCLC Name/Address Directory permits the storage online of information specific to each library's ILL policies, and the development of a statistical package for ILL

may help produce some standardization in the maintenance and reporting of ILL traffic throughout the system. Within less than twenty months OCLC's ILL subsystem had logged 1 million requests, and the rate of traffic is steadily increasing as more libraries participate. From July 1 1980 through March 31 1981, for example, 696,799 requests were channeled through the subsystem; over the same time a year later, the number of requests rose to 830,368.[20] Although the goals of the Shared Resources Program at RLG are the same as those of the OCLC ILL Subsystem; i.e., complete location information and access to as much of the member library collections as possible, the character of the program is somewhat different. "What was and is traditionally interlibrary loan is different in RLG, specifically in terms of its responsibilities. It is not a courtesy, but a commitment on the part of the RLG member/owners."[21] Some of the other differences between RLG's program and that of OCLC are the character of the clientele and of the material being requested and loaned; whereas OCLC serves a very large general library population, RLG's membership stresses the function of research as its purpose. As a result, material loaned through RLG is often older and more unique; the preponderance of OCLC's lending is of materials less than a decade old.

In addition to the policy of priority treatment for RLG requests at member libraries, other standards are in force within the Shared Resources Program. "There are no charges for lending or photocopying from one RLG library collection to another. And members are strongly encouraged to lend within RLG items that they wouldn't ordinarily lend. This is important, because cooperative collection development decisions have been made based

upon the expected availability of material at other institutions."[22]

Until May of 1982 RLG operated the RLIN ILL Message Subsystem as its interlibrary loan program. It was created because the TWX system, which had been instituted in 1975 when RLG membership numbered only four, was beginning to fall apart. RLG began planning the ILL Message Subsystem in 1979, and in the summer of 1980 began using it "as a bandaid; it was meant to be a temporary system to serve until the development of a fullfledged ILL system." [23]

Even before the availability of the message subsystem ILL within RLG was very significant, due to the quality of the shared data base and the system's indexing capabilities: "the use of RLIN for validation of ILL requests is enhanced by the ability of the searcher to locate books without precise knowledge of author and title and by the ability of the system to display library specific call numbers. Further the search can segment the data base in such a way as to display only those records that are held by a specified library or group of libraries."[24] But the message system made available some additional benefits, such as record-keeping facility. "The great advantage of using the message system is that the gathering of statistics on transactions is now automatic. Each month members receive a detailed summary of computerized interlibrary loan requests,

showing the member as both borrower and lender."[25]

RLG expects to implement its RLIN ILL Subsystem in August 1982. The design of the system is based upon the features identified by member representatives which would comprise an appropriate full-scale interlibrary loan model. "The differences between the temporary system and the subsystem are three: the new system is linked to the bibliographic data files; it will be possible to forward requests via a routing procedure; and the system will provide much more complete statistics in terms of request turnaround time."[26]

Use of the ILL message system reached peaks of 5000 requests per month during periods of heaviest traffic; successful requests averaged about 60% of these. [27] It is expected that the implementation of the RLIN ILL subsystem with its direct link to RLIN's bibliographic data files will increase this rate of successful requests significantly.

The "search only" function offered by RLG to libraries which are not member/owners enhances the interlibrary loan program of the Washington Library Network, through its agreement with RLG to share bibliographic data bases. The WLN had already designed its own holdings file to facilitate interlibrary loan, and encourages a commitment to shared access through its Memorandum of Agreement among Washington libraries, as noted earlier. As membership increases, especially in the number of academic libraries participating, and as retrospective conversions of member libraries' collections are completed, it is expected that the ILL function will enjoy a greater success rate for materials published more than a decade ago.

INTERLIBRARY LOAN AT SELECTED LIBRARIES

Academic libraries have been at the forefront of network development and shared resources programs for two decades, largely because the benefits to their operations and to their patrons have outweighed in the long term the sometimes staggering short-term costs in staffing and resource allocation. Interlibrary loan has traditionally been the major resource sharing model for academic libraries, and has been strengthened in that role with each new generation of resource sharing technology and philosophy. The growth of the major bibliographic utilities and access to their data bases for ILL searching has had a major impact on the character of interlibrary lending, but the effects of these changes at the local level have not been discussed. Some issues to consider include the changes in quantity of loans and borrowings at an academic library, the effect of the changing workload on staffing configurations, the effect of utility-enhanced ILL on previously existing resource sharing programs, the quality of the information provided by the utilities for interlibrary loan, changes in recordkeeping both for internal purposes and for comparison with other libraries, and patron reaction to the newer system.

Librarians at six academic institutions agreed to review and discuss some of these issues based upon their library's experience as a member/user of a major bibliographic utility.

Since interlibrary loan practices and recordkeeping procedures differ considerably from one location to another, a formal comparison of only quantitative data across libraries may not yield meaningful results. Profiles of each library were developed on a case basis, using data and situational information supplied by representatives at each of the participating libraries. A population of six libraries cannot serve to represent the experience of academic libraries in general; however, libraries who agreed to assist with this review are representative of a variety of academic library types and locations. They are the libraries of

Cornell University, Ithaca, New York (CU)

George Washington University, Washington, D.C. (GWU)

Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana (ISU)

Ithaca College, Ithaca, New York (IC)

Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois (LFC)

St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minnesota. (St.O)

The interlibrary loan and other institutional data supplied by the participating libraries varied greatly in scope and format. All libraries kept information regarding either the total number of requests made or received, or the total number of items sent or received, but in only a few cases records were kept of both requests and successful transactions. Most libraries kept some record of their participation through ILL in shared resources programs, usually to provide some quantifiable feedback to the cooperative service regarding the library's use of the system. A few of the libraries kept track of the transmission mode of the

requests sent and received, an item of interest here, to corroborate the qualitative information supplied about the use of OCLC as a requesting channel.

The format of reports from each library differed from each other in virtually every way. In some cases, similar items were not reported in the same way so that similar figures do not yield an accurate view of the libraries' ILL patterns. In addition, the format for reporting at some of the institutions changed over time to reflect changes in the library's lending and borrowing patterns, affiliations with cooperative arrangements, technological advances in the library, or a change in the library administration. In most cases, the data is collected and kept to serve internal needs such as staffing and financial allocations; or the information may be made available to consortia or networks in which the library is a member, so that its comparability, especially across libraries which are somewhat dissimilar, is difficult to see.

To attempt to address these issues, some standard reporting tables were devised which demonstrate in general ways the patterns which exist at each library, and allow for some comparison between and among the libraries. The tables reflect the categories which all libraries report, to greater and lesser degrees.

Some definitions of terminology are appropriate here. "Consortia" or "cooperatives" include any reciprocal cooperative arrangement to lending and borrowing to which the library belongs; for example, ISU's membership in the Four University Libraries System, St. Olaf's participation in MINITEX,

the Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange. "Special services" designates unilateral information/materials suppliers to the requesting library, such as the Center for Research Libraries or the ACM Metropolitan Periodicals Center. "Other" means any other library request or loan which does not fall under the first two categories. "Transmission mode" means the vehicle by which the request is channeled from one library to another; OCLC inputting, TWX communication, ALA standard form, phone are some examples. In the context of these tables the following designations apply: "NA" signifies that the category is not available; "X" indicates that a particular categorical distinction was not made by the participating library.

Indiana State University: Cunningham Memorial Library

Indiana State University (ISU) is a publicly supported state university which was founded in 1870 as a multi-program institution. Its student population numbers about 8,930 full-time and 1,630 part-time undergraduates, and about 490 full-time and 1305 part-time graduates. ISU's courses of study are general in nature, with some emphasis on service-oriented programs such as guidance and counselling, criminology, health and safety, library science, home economics, and management and finance.[28]

Cunningham Memorial Library is the central library facility on campus; a Science Library also serves ISU patrons. The collection is comprised of the following:

Total volumes	844,994
Microforms	410,904
Audiovisual materials	49,085
Serial subscriptions	4,750

Special collections at ISU include the Cordell Collection of Rare and Early Dictionaries, which contain several valuable and unique items.

Total operating expenses for FY 1979-80 were $1,727,019. ISU operates with a staff of 30 professionals and 45.5 FTE support staff.[29]

Participation in cooperative arrangements is a tradition at ISU, due to its location and its relationship with the other major Indiana libraries. In addition to the Four State University Libraries Group, ISU also enjoys membership in the Center for Research Libraries, and the Indiana Cooperative

Library Services Authority. ISU's collection development philosophy and its interlibrary cooperation patterns are based upon the efficacy of resource sharing as the most appropriate response to increased demands on collections and budgets. The ISU Annual Library Reports reflect this commitment to cooperation: "Although it has long been evident that no one academic library, even the largest, can acquire all research materials of interest because of budget limitations, proliferation of published materials and inflation, only in recent years have appropriate mechanisms for the sharing of resources been developed."[30] ISU is fortunate to have available "the combined resources of more than forty academic, public, private, school and special libraries within a seventy-five mile radius of Terre Haute."[31]

ISU's Interlibrary Loan Office began using the OCLC bibliographic system when it was installed in 1976 for the verification and location information of interlibrary loan requests. The system was viewed as "an integral part of our automated systems, which promote efficient utilization of staff in acquisition, cataloging, interlibrary loan, and the processing of materials."[32] The following year a public services OCLC terminal was installed to provide more rapid access for reference and interlibrary loan purposes. In 1979 recognition of the Interlibrary Loan Office's function and the institution of the OCLC ILL Subsystem prompted the administration to place additional emphasis on the ILL process: "As libraries have become more and more aware of the need to share resources, the role of the Interlibrary Loan Unit in the Reference Department has become

increasingly important to the support of the university academic programs. As a result ILL services have been expanded and improved. A new OCLC terminal and printer were installed for ILL in the autumn of 1979."[33]

The OCLC ILL subsystem has had a major impact on the process of interlibrary loan at ISU, according to Mary Ann Phillips, spokesperson for the Interlibrary Loan Unit. The effects have been in terms of accuracy of requests, number, and speed with which requests are handled. In addition, some shift in patterns of borrowing by ISU has been noted. "We don't request by 'shooting in the dark' as much as previously. The existence of more locations speeds up the request process, and we request more material from lesser known libraries."[34] Even before the subsystem was in effect, the ILL Unit used the OCLC as a searching and verification tool "as much as possible, especially for newer items."[35]

The Interlibrary Loan Unit is staffed by two half-time librarians, two full-time clerical assistants and another clerical assistant whose time in ILL is approximately half-time. The staff size of the Unit has increased since OCLC was implemented; this was due to the increase in work from the implementation of data base searching at the same time that the subsystem was installed. In general, the staff enjoys and appreciates the benefits of the system, since it allows for easier processing and followup of requests. The staff perceives some difficulty in that "There is definitely more pressure on the staff's time because it's necessary to reply to requests within four days."[36]

OCLC's effect on the consortium arrangement to which ISU belongs has been one of procedure rather than substance. Rather than routing requests from one of the Four State University Libraries to another via the state-subsidized TWX, these requests are forwarded through the OCLC system. Requests among these libraries are afforded priority treatment at each lender, on a free service basis. In the past few years requests within this consortium have decreased, due to material availabilit at other libraries as reflected by OCLC holdings. In general, patron response to the increased availability of information about other library's collections has been enthusiastic. The public access OCLC terminal is very heavily used for determining the locations of wanted materials, especially more recent items.[37]

ISU's patterns of recordkeeping for ILL remained relatively constant over the years; as the OCLC subsystem received more use, the channels of some of the requests changed. Rather than relying upon the state-subsidized TWX system, ISU used the OCLC subsystem for the bulk of their requests. Table 1 indicates a large increase in overall borrowing by ISU between 1977-8 and 1978-9. This is due in part to increased access to materials, but the method of counting requests had changed to one which counted each submission of a request as a separate one.

Table 2 indicates that, for materials libraries requested from ISU, no records were kept until 1978. This suggests the philosophical framework which defined ISU as a borrower rather than a lender until the library's collections became accessible to other libraries through OCLC. The pattern of increased lending is

Table 1

Total Requests by

Indiana State University Library

Year	Books			Photocopies		
	Req	Filled #	%	Req	Filled #	%
1976	686[1]	367	53	752	897	
1977	878	384	44	638	403	63
1978	2655	1845	69	1167	952	81
1979	3273	1964	60	1518	1282	84
1980	3849	1988	52	1849	1316	71
1981	6136[2]	1776	29	2908	1544	53

[1] Each transmission is counted as a request.
[2] OCLC ILL Subsystem used as main ILL vehicle.

Table 2

Total Requests to

Indiana State University Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Books			Photocopies		
	Req	Filled #	%	Req	Filled #	%
1976	NA[1]	NA		NA	NA	
1977	3736	NA		NA	NA	
1978	5403[2]	2066	38	X	X	
1979	6478	3337	51	X	X	
1980	4793	3140	65	X	X	
1981	5391	3464	64	X	X	

[1] No record of outside requests kept until 1977.
[2] Total number of requests only available.

continuing, according to ISU staff.

The data contained in Table 3 reflects the diffculties which libraries encountered as the OCLC functions impacted more and more upon the interlibrary loan systems. Much of the data regarding requests made by ISU is reported in such a way as to negate its importance. It is hoped that as categories and patterns of lending and borrowing become more stable over time recordkeeping routines will follow suit. Table 3 does indicate a decrease in dependence on special services such as the Center for Research Libraries as the availability of items through the cataloging data base grew. A pattern of increasing dependence on libraries which are not part of the cooperative arrangement is noted in Table 3 also.

Table 4 indicates the requests which ISU received either through cooperative arrangements or from libraries outside that membership. No data is available until 1978, which then indicates a significant interest in ISU's collection on the part of libraries outside the membership of the cooperative.

In general, the information on interlibrary lending which ISU keeps is compiled for the purposes of defining their relationship to the Four State University Libraries and to the State Library system. Until recently, virtually all requests were channeled through these means. But the increased access to ISU's collection data by libraries across the country should bring about a change in recordkeeping to reflect the breadth of the interlibrary loan base. Also, with the advent of OCLC it seems that libraries are finding it difficult to distinguish between

Table 3

Total Requests by

Indiana State University Library

Year	Through Cooperatives[1]				Through Special Services[2]				To Other Libraries[3]			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1976	686	367	752	897	NA	NA	183	118	1082	859	826	693
1977	878	384	638	403	NA	NA	431	NA	828	464	179	145
1978	NA	797	NA	821	NA	NA	NA	212	1013	NA	432	NA
1979	NA	829	NA	1115	NA	48	NA	35	1139	NA	NA	135
1980	NA	887	NA	1182	NA	236	NA	25	NA	1101	NA	109
1981	NA	964	NA	1494	NA	210	NA	13	NA	812	NA	135

[1] Four Indiana University Libraries
[2] CRL, JAS
[3] Includes both instate and out-of state loans not through cooperative arrangement.

37

Table 4

Total Requests to

Indiana State University Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Through Cooperatives[1]				From Other Libraries[2]			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill
1976	NA[3]	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1977	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
1978	NA	193	NA	298	NA	1013	NA	432
1979	NA	226	NA	160	3993	1381	433	202
1980	NA	854	NA	231	NA	2286[4]	NA	X
1981	NA	929	NA	313	NA	2535	NA	X

1 Four State University Libraries
2 All others, including other instate libraries
3 No data available for before 1978
4 Includes books and photocopies

OCLC as a request vehicle and OCLC as a cooperative arrangement in which they take part. This causes much duplication in numbers across categories of loans. Some review and refinement of data collecting routines may in the long run provide ISU with information which will be more reflective of their interlibrary loan use. ISU's traditional use of interlibrary loan has been very strong; it is increasing in strength as the University library becomes a lender on equal par with its borrowing. Information which supports the impression of ISU's interlibrary loan program as a high quality one, and which could be shared with a wider audience, would certainly enhance the impact of the program.

Cornell University: Olin Library

Cornell University (CU) is unique in many ways, as is its library. Located in Ithaca, New York, Cornell was founded in 1856 by Ezra Cornell, whose goal was to establish a university at which men and women could have the opportunity to pursue whatever course of study they desired. It began as a privately supported coeducational institution which offered three courses of study. Expansion of areas of study and its designation as a state university shortly after its opening have increased its schools and colleges to sixteen and have endowed on Cornell a dual personality; those of an Ivy League university and a state university whose emphases are very strongly rooted in agriculture and life sciences. Programs of study include general arts programs and a great number of scientific and technological development areas, such as space sciences and nuclear studies. Enrollment for 1980-81 included 11,235 fulltime undergraduates and 664 parttime undergraduates. Graduate enrollment totalled 5,025 for the same year.[38]

Seventeen libraries on the Ithaca campus comprise the Cornell University Libraries system. Olin, the graduate library, is the center of the university structure and houses the administration and major service points for the system. CU's collection contains

Book Volumes	3,888,634
Periodical Titles	49,610
Microforms	1,048,618
Sound Recordings	14,094

About 175,000 items are added to the collection each

year.[39]

The Cornell University Library system employs 125 professional librarians and 269 support staff. Approximately half of these are employed at Olin Library.[40]

Because of the size and excellence of its collections, the CU library has been eagerly solicited as a potential member in a variety of library cooperative programs and consortia. CU was one of the original members of the Five Associated University Libraries (FAUL), and still remains a member of this almost-defunct group because of FAUL's OCLC link. It is also relied upon to a great extent by the South Central Research Library Council, a subset of the 3-R's system in New York State and a link to the New York State Interlibrary Loan system. In addition to its membership in the Association of Research Libraries and the Center for Research Libraries, the Cornell University Library is a very active member/owner of RLG, Inc.[41]

Its ability to fill interlibrary loan requests for a great majority of requesting libraries and and the quality of its interlibrary loan processing have made CU's library a very big lender over the years. This is also due to its position in New York State as the major research collection outside the city of New York. The quality of Cornell's cataloging is credited with affecting the amount of borrowing from CU, since the cataloging represents a collection which is both broad and deep in scope.

The Interlibrary Loan staff at Olin Library that processes over 30,000 incoming and outgoing requests per year includes two librarians, five fulltime assistants, two half-time assistants,

and approximately twenty hours of student assistance per week. In addition, each library on campus has a staff member who serves as the interlibrary loan representative as part of his or her duties.

The staff has decreased during the past year; the change is due to the decision by Cornell to drop a contract with the South Central Research Library Council (SCRLC) for searching member libraries' interlibrary loan requests using Olin Library's facilities.

According to Patricia Schafer, Head of Interlibrary Loan Services at Cornell, "RLG came in at a good time." At the same time budget cuts began to have a noticeable effect on service, patrons' sophistication about and expectations of the interlibrary loan service were increasing.[42] Using the RLIN cataloging data base to verify and locate interlibrary library loan items after its installation at Cornell in December of 1979, and then implementing the ILL Message System in March 1981 helped the interlibrary loan office deal with both of these pressures.

The impact of RLG membership for Cornell's users and its interlibrary loan program is, according to Schafer, of a mostly positive nature. In terms of borrowing materials for Cornell's patrons, the locations from which Cornell borrows are basically the same libraries from which they requested material prior to their participation in RLIN. Schafer finds that RLIN membership has simplified the routine ILL processing somewhat: "The process is just much easier for us now. As a borrower, we get priority service at other RLG libraries. Our requests are searched

immediately, the material is delivered via UPS (United Parcel Service), and there is a wider range of materials that other libraries are willing to lend within the RLG system."[43] In addition, no fees for borrowing or requesting photocopies are charged between RLG libraries. Schafer has found that between 60% and 65% of all Cornell's interlibrary loan requests are supplied through RLG.

From Cornell's point of view, the difficulties encountered in using RLG's ILL Message System have largely to do with staffing and Cornell's service to non-RLG libraries.

The increasing interlibrary loan traffic through Olin Library's office since the implementation of RLG's system has caused the interlibrary loan staff to be "stretched" somewhat more than previously. This is due to the priority nature of many requests: "One of the biggest effects on us is the increase in priority services, for which we are not reimbursed."[44] In principle, mutual exchange of priority services among libraries acts as a self-reimbursing system, but the role of Cornell as a major lender rather than a borrower negates that view. Approximately twenty-five RLG priority requests are received by Cornell each day, in addition to the hundred or so New York State ILL requests, which are also considered priority items.

In addition to increasing staff workload, expectations of the staff's knowledge and capabilities have increased. Support staff in the interlibrary loan function are expected to be more sophisticated in the use of complex tools and routines. To address this, Cornell's Reference and Interlibrary Loan

Department is writing a manual to train staff in the use of newer library technologies. Unfortunately, according to Schafer, knowledge of and familiarity with older standard bibliographic tools suffers, since time for training is usually limited by the demands of the interlibrary loan function.[45]

The relationship of Cornell as a major lender of materials to non-RLG libraries has been affected by the imposition of the RLG interlibrary loan system over pre-existing arrangements and traditions. Schafer states, "A question that bothers me is how we meet our responsibilities to the other libraries who need what our collection has to offer."[46] Since the size of interlibrary loan staff remains the same as demand for its time increases, it is difficult to maintain the same quality of service for all borrowers. At Cornell, the interlibrary loan office is attempting to address this issue by redesigning the request workflow "so that people without a contract or who aren't consortium members don't get less and less service."[47] Also, Cornell is encouraging the use of other channels for libraries whose patrons need Cornell's resources. A photocopy service for SCRLC members is under consideration; in addition, patrons from SCRLC libraries can borrow materials directly from Cornell, provided that the fee for interlibrary lending is paid by the borrower.[48]

A review of the information supplied by CU confirms the status of Cornell as a major lender whose collection is increasingly in demand. Table 1 indicates the requests which Cornell's Olin Library has placed for its patrons. The decrease

Table 1

Total Requests by

Cornell University Library

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled # / %	Req	Filled # / %
1978	1887	1105 / 58	855	503 / 59
1979	1598	999 / 62	989	521 / 53
1980	2516	1552 / 62	1548	899 / 58
1981	2724	1647 / 60	1429	908 / 63

Table 2

Total Requests to

Cornell University Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled # / %	Req	Filled # / %
1978	12584	5875 / 46	13995	9676 / 69
1979	13246	6286 / 47	15390	9878 / 64
1980	13591	6936 / 51	17201	12439 / 72
1981	13244	7132 / 54	16644	11351 / 68

in 1979 was due in part to the office's reorganization and shift to the RLIN system. Table 2 shows that Cornell routinely supplies over 400 percent more interlibrary loans than it receives. This is likely to continue through the priority lending system of RLIN, of which CU is a valued member. Table 2 also indiates a steady increase in the ability of the CU office to fill requests. This reflects two phenomena: the quality of the staff and procedures at CU's ILL Office and the likelihood that more items are identified through the RLIN system as being held by CU prior to their being requested.

Tables 3 and 4 reflect the substantial involvement oF CU in formal Interlibrary Loan arrangements through RLG and NYSILL: in 1981-82, 70% of CU's requests were placed through RLG or NYSILL; 68% of their filled requests were provided through RLG or NYSILL. 73% of the requests received by CU were placed through one or the other group, and 75% of the requests filled by CU were for RLG or NYSILL members.

The consistently good quality of ILL service at CU, and the strengths of the CU collection are evident in the Table 3 and Table 4 data. Regardless of the channels used for requests to an by CU, the success rate is almost always above 55%, a modest estimate, since requests going to other libraries are counted each time they are transmitted.

Table 3

Total Requests by

Cornell University (Olin LIbrary)

Year	Through Cooperatives[1]				Through Special Services[2]				To Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1980[3]	1495	910	1136	688	217	145	114	50	825	491	297	161
1981	1698	1006	1132	727	189	117	22	14	837	524	275	167

[1] Includes RLG, NYSILL
[2] Includes CRL, JAS
[3] Table 3 data available for 1980-1, 1981-2 only

Table 4

Total Requests to Cornell University

From Other Libraries

Year	Through Cooperatives[1]				To Other Libraries[2]			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1980[3]	23036	13278		NA	7756	5447		NA
1981	9951	5473	11930	8516	3293	1659	4714	2835

[1] Includes RLG, NYSILL
[2] No breakdown for books / photocopies
[3] Table 4 data available for 1980-1, 1981-2 only

Lake Forest College: Donnelley Library

Lake Forest College (LFC) is a private liberal arts college about forty miles north of Chicago. Founded in 1857 as Lind University, it was originally affiliated with the Presbyterian Church. It is now a non-sectarian coeducational institution with an undergraduate population of about 1,100 students. LFC offers courses of study in the liberal arts and traditional sciences, and programs leading to degrees in computer science and business have recently been instituted. In addition, LFC houses the Lake Forest School of Management, a private program for advanced management training.[49]

The Donnelley Library at Lake Forest College supports the various courses of study offered through its collection and through its affiliations with several cooperatives and consortia. These include LIBRAS, a consortium of thirteen small academic libraries in the Chicago area; the North Suburban Library System (NSLS), and multi-type library network which is part of the the Illinois Library Network (ILLINET), the Illinois OCLC-related network for bibliographic data base use; the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago; and the Library Computer System, a circulation services network designed by and based at the University of Illinois whose membership includes approximately 20 academic libraries in the state of Illinois. In addition, LFC maintains membership in the Metropolitan Periodicals Service, a periodicals bank originally established by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest, of which Lake Forest College is a member.[50]

The collection which these cooperative arrangements

supplement consists of

Book Volumes	181,856
Book Titles	144,561
Periodical Volumes	21,000
Periodical Titles	1,000
Microform Titles	8,000[51]

These materials are housed in Donnelley and in the Freeman Science Library. Lake Forest College's tradition of interlibrary cooperation is a strong one, built upon the richness of Chicago area academic and public libraries. Prior to the institution of OCLC as a searching and verification tool, interlibrary loan traffic was very light (usually less than 200 items loaned to others per year), partially because needed material was easily accessible from libraries in the immediate area. OCLC's implementation at Lake Forest dramatically increased lending and borrowing through Lake Forest's interlibrary loan service. Library Director Arthur Miller notes, "Before OCLC, the number of our interlibrary loans wasn't significant. At that time, they increased from less than 500 or so to 2,000 a year. The numbers have remained relatively stable since then; the big difference is in the sources of the material we request."[52] In 1974-75, for example, over 75% of the requested items were from libraries in the Chicago area.[53]

Staffing for LFC's Interlibrary Loan has recently been comprised of one full-time library assistant under the supervision of the Reference Department, with approximately forty hours per week of student assistant time. Routines for the staff have

changed with the advent first of OCLC and then of the Library Computer System, but staffing hours have remained stable.

A major indication of the increase at LFC on the Interlibrary Loan program is the rise in the number of students who avail themselves of this service. From a population of approximately 1100, 383 students used the ILL service during the 1981-82 academic year, representing over 30% of the student population. This percentage is increasing each year, and increased awareness of the capabilities of OCLC and the Library Computer System are credited with the increase.[54]

While the number of users of the ILL system increases, the number of requests by them seem to have stabilized and have actually decreased, according to the information contained in Table 1. Miller attributes the decrease to the effectiveness of the bibliographic instruction program at LFC, which educates users on the use of their own library and teaches students the value of selective requesting of material; and to the use of past ILL requests as a collection development guide. A heavily represented area in ILL during one year is considered a potential area for increased purchasing of needed materials the next.

Table 2 provides dramatic evidence of the effects of shared cataloging through OCLC. Prior to data input for cataloging, which was then accessed by other libraries for search and locate purposes, total requests to LFC, including books and photocopies, numbered just 315. By 1980 that figure had increased over six times.

As a member of several cooperative groups and networks.

Table 1

Total Requests by

Lake Forest College Library

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled # / %	Req	Filled
1975	2881	842 / 29	NA	1591
1976	2763	1113 / 40	NA	1409
1977	2667	1044 / 39	NA	1588
1978	2406	1359 / 56	NA	1214
1979	2464	1197 / 48	NA	1069

Table 2

Total Requests to

Lake Forest College Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled	Req	Filled
1975	NA	246	NA	69
1976	646	599	NA	201
1977	NA	556	NA	430
1978	NA	571	NA	508
1979	NA	1222	NA	463
1980	NA	1572	NA	418

LFC's patterns of requests to libraries within these groups usually outweigh requests to all other libraries. Table 3 indicates that a significant change began to develop in 1978-9, when reliance upon cooperative ILL programs was not as evident. It is likely that OCLC searching and locating provided other channels for interlibrary borrowing for LFC. A major shift in requesting routines is evident in the use of OCLC for requesting ILL material, beginning in 1978 and coinciding with the decreasing use of the formal cooperative arrangements in which LFC takes part. The effect of the Library Computer System on LFC's use of local networks for borrowing should prove to be interesting; that data will be available for 1981-82 within a short time.

Table 4 again reflects the attractiveness of LFC's collection to libraries outside the local networks. As requests through pre-established channels remain stable and even decrease slightly, requests to LFC from other libraries tripled between 1978 and 1979, and then doubled again in 1980. The effect of the LCS may change this emphasis.

Lake Forest College's library collection is a good example of the hidden wealth of smaller academic libraries all across the country whose resources were never reported or utilized until the advent of the shared cataloging data base through OCLC. Special collections of much potential value to scholars and students have remained hidden from all except those with first-hand knowledge of their existence. Access to these collections has usually been through informal "word-of-mouth" networks, through libraries in

Table 3

Total Requests by

Lake Forest College Library

Year	Through Cooperatives [1]				Through Special Services [2]				To Other Libraries [3]			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1975	NA	579	NA	888	X	X	NA	650	NA	263	NA	53
1976	NA	773	NA	1001	X	X	NA	340	NA	340	NA	68
1977	NA	789	NA	817	X	X	NA	722	NA	255	NA	49
1978	NA	480	NA	500	X	X	NA	672	NA	879	NA	42
1979	NA	299	NA	149	X	X	NA	1021	NA	898	NA	54
1980	NA	107	NA	75	X	X	NA	951	NA	600	NA	143

1 Includes NSLS, LIBRAS, Health Sciences Consortium
2 ACM Periodical Bank, later named Metropolitan Periodicals Service
3 Includes OCLC as channel for ILL requests

Table 4

Total Requests to

Lake Forest College Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Through Cooperatives				From Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill
1976	NA	529	NA	201	NA	70	NA	0
1977	NA	444	NA	422	NA	112	NA	8
1978	NA	382	NA	495	NA	189	NA	13
1979	NA	582	NA	434	NA	640	NA	29
1980	NA	549	NA	405	NA	1048	NA	13

the same vicinity. The use, first, of the OCLC cataloging data base for Interlibrary loan searching and locating, and later of the OCLC ILL subsystem, opened the collections of lesser known institutions to the scrutiny and use of patrons from a wide variety of institutions. Lake Forest, like the other small colleges described here, houses special collections of which larger research libraries have availed themselves.

Another reason for the increased popularity of smaller library collections is the belief, usually based on experience, that the ILL service at a smaller library is likely to be more prompt and accurate than that available from a larger research library. Borrowers may soon find, though, that the traditional quality of service from smaller lenders will suffer as a result of the widespread and growing access to previously underreported and underutilized collections.

George Washington University: Gelman Library

George Washington University (GWU), an urban campus in northwest Washington D.C., was founded in 1821 by a group of Baptists "inspired by George Washington's desire for the establishment of a national university in the federal city."[55] Its present undergraduate population includes 5,098 fulltime and 1,274 parttime students; graduates number 3,761 fulltime and 5,696 parttime students. Its population is truly national in its representation: students hail from all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and about 120 foreign countries. The eleven colleges or divisions include Arts and Sciences, Medicine, Law, Government, Engineering, and Experimental Programs.

Three major libraries exist at GWU; the Gelman Library is the University library. The Law Schoool and the School of Medicine and Health Sciences maintain substantial collections. The collection housed in the University Library consists of

Book Volumes	859,802
Periodical Titles	8,959
Visual Material (Microforms)	350,423
Audio Material	5,887[56]

The Gelman Library staff includes 22.5 librarians and 66.5 support staff, many of whom are very involved in the local cooperative arrangements of which GWU is a member. These include the Consortium of Universities of the Washington Metropolitan Area (CAPCON) and the Metropolitan Washington Library Council.

The functions of CAPCON have recently been separated from the consortium, and CAPCON has expanded its membership to include

about forty members, many of whom are smaller academic libraries in the surrounding D.C. metropolitan area. The Consortium is investigating new cooperative projects for its members, including collection development and serials records programs.[57]

The GWU libraries recently considered the possibility of entering the RLG system, but decided because of time constraints and the existence of several major projects at the libraries, such as the installation of the DataPhase circulation system, to delay such a decision.[58]

By virtue of its central location and extensive collections, GWU has traditionally been a very heavy lender to area libraries of all types. Borrowing is by far lighter than lending, according to Joan Lippincott, Head of Reference at the Gelman Library. In fact, the major ILL policy change this year addressed the issue of local borrowing abuses through which local business or government library users began to use the direct interlibrary loan service which was offered as a courtesy as a private paging service. Librarians found that the Interlibrary Loan Office staff of one full-time paraprofessional and student assistants was increasingly delayed in the performance of other ILL related tasks because of the abuse of the direct loan service. GWU has found it necessary to institute a fee-based service in its place.[59]

Staffing in the ILL Office is very light, when the quantity of requests filled by GWU through various channels is taken into consideration. "But this year a new reference position has been established which includes interlibrary loan duties. The new

reference librarian has been working with the ILL Office approximately half of her time."[60]

Use of OCLC as an interlibrary loan vehicle has contributed to the increase in interlibrary loan noted by the staff. They cite ease of access to information about recently published materials and the richness of the metropolitan area's library collections as two reasons for the increase. In GWU's case, both borrowing and lending have seen steady growth in numbers, but GWU's role is still largely as a lender rather than a borrower.

Transmission of ILL requests to and from GWU's library has changed as well; as OCLC's system became accessible, the number of mail requests decreased and the TWX communications system was discarded.[61]

The installation of DataPhase as GWU Library's circulation system has had some effect on the interlibrary loan process, too. ILL staff can check the DataPhase online catalog to determine the location and availability of materials at GWU. The system also provides some flexibility in setting due dates for interlibrary loans of various categories.[62]

Since the reporting format for ILL which GWU staff has devised over the years accurately reflects the routines and patterns of ILL at the Gelman Library, it is unfortunate that some data was not available for use in this report. Figures for the years represented are estimated from the data supplied. Even with incomplete information, some patterns do emerge in terms of use of GWU's collection.

The average rate of over 90% at which requests from GWU to

Table 1

Total Requests by

George Washington University Library

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled # %	Req	Filled # %
1979	1044	948 / 90	252	216 / 89
1980	1080	1008 / 93	444	432 / 97
1981	1176	1044 / 88	360	348 / 96

Table 2

Total Requests to

George Washington University Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled # %	Req	Filled # %
1979	5402	4000 / 79	641	401 / 63
1980	5524	4264 / 77	1172	984 / 84
1981	5520	4075 / 74	885	605 / 68

other libraries are filled, as indicated in Table 1, suggests that the ILL staff at GWU performs the search and locate function thoroughly and requests materials from appropriate sources.

Table 2 indicates the quality of GWU's service to others; the success rate of requests to GWU is about 80%. And figures estimated by prorating the number of requests over the number of months to arrive at a general yearly figure suggest a steadily increasing pattern of book lending. A comparison of Table 1 with Table 2 indicates that GWU lends to other libraries approximately five times as much material as they borrow. Photocopy delivery is more evenly distributed; GWU requests almost as many from other libraries as they send.

GWU uses CAPCON as a vehicle for local requests. But the large majority of requests from GWU to other libraries are sent outside the consortium, as Table 3 indicates. Table 4 reinforces the status of GWU as a major lender; indications are that the majority of requests to GWU from other libraries are requests from libraries within the metropolitan area who are not members of the consortium. This is a traditional role for GWU, by virtue of its location in the metropolitan Washington area and its proximity to many smaller specialized libraries. About 78% of the books loaned by GWU are for libraries in the immediate area; 68% of the photocopy requests filled by the Gelman Library are for local libraries.

The format which GWU has adopted for reporting Interlibrary Loan traffic is based more upon the present patterns of ILL networking and request than the formats adopted by other

Table 3

Total Requests by

George Washington University Library

Year	Through Cooperatives				Through Special Services				To Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1979	103	NA	103	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	847	NA	319	NA
1980	240	NA	251	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4036	NA	761	NA
1981	175	NA	91	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	2515	NA	396	NA

Table 4

Total Requests to

George Washington University Library

From Other Libraries

Year	Through Cooperatives				From Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill
1979	120	NA	112	NA	3993	NA	204	NA
1980	240	NA	NA	NA	4036	NA	NA	NA
1981	266	NA	206	NA	3811	NA	676	NA

libraries discussed here. The format which GWU currently uses attempts to anticipate the several uses to which the data can be put. GWU was keeping a separate count of materials requested via OCLC and ALA form, but discarded that format, although that data in particular could prove useful in the future.

St. Olaf College: Rølvaag Memorial Library

St. Olaf College is a private coeducational institution which was established in 1874 in Northfield, Minnesota. The college is affiliated with the American Lutheran Church, and has a nationally renowned music program, in addition to strong courses of study in religion and history. The entirely resident population equals 2,991 full-time and 77 part-time undergraduates. St. Olaf College is a member of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and participates in their internship and study/travel programs for consortium students.[63]

Rolvaag Memorial Library at St. Olaf houses the majority of the college's collection; the Music Library is the second major library on campus. The collection consists of

Book Titles	224,763
Book Volumes	300,511
Periodical Subscriptions	1,135
Periodical Volumes Bound	25,884
Microforms	23,995[64]

The library takes part in the Associated Colleges of the Midwest library programs and projects, and was one of the libraries to participate in the Council on Library Resources funded project to study circulation use in academic libraries in 1980. St. Olaf's link to the OCLC network is through the Minnesota Interlibrary Telecommunications Exchange (MINITEX), upon which St. Olaf relies for a great majority of its interlibrary loans. Other cooperative arrangements include a mutual use agreement with the library of neighboring Carleton

College, which is also a member of the Associated Colleges of the Midwest.

The success of the OCLC/MINITEX link for St. Olaf College is evidenced by the number of requests made by St. Olaf users each year, and the estimate by Interlibrary Loan office staff that approximately 90% of all material requested through MINITEX, 75% of which are for photocopies of periodical articles, are filled within MINITEX.[65] Very heavy borrowing characterizes St. Olaf's interlibrary loan patterns, but the number of requests received from other libraries has increased significantly since the implementation of OCLC as a cataloging system and informal interlibrary loan location tool. Staff share the opinion that OCLC has had a major impact on St.. Olaf's interlibrary loan routines. "The influence of OCLC upon the number of requests we receive from other libraries is very evident. We began cataloging through OCLC in January 1977, and soon afterwards began a program of retrospective conversion. By April 1979 we had 33,524 holdings recorded; and by April 1982 we had 134,642, or about 60% of our holdings."[66] As more records became more accessible to more libraries, the library became a resource for a much wider audience than previously. Collections of high quality, such as the religion and music materials, were recognized as useful for a much wider audience.

Data supplied by St. Olaf College was mostly qualitative in nature; in the past, quantifiable data was not necessary for the operation of St. Olaf's ILL program. St. Olaf's ILL records were kept for internal purposes; no data on cooperative arrangements

was ever compiled. The view that general data on ILL traffic is sufficient may change as more requests are forwarded to St. Olaf. The pattern which has developed at St. Olaf, evidenced by Table 1 and Table 2, indicates that requests to St. Olaf's library have increased significantly since the adoption of OCLC's cataloging while requests from St. Olaf have gradually decreased. This is attributed to increased sophistication on students' parts in the use of indexes and abstracts, the subscription to frequently requested periodicals and the adoption of more careful request screening routines.

Table 1

Total Requests[1] by

St. Olaf College Library

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled	Req	Filled
1970	932	839	3211	2890
1971	1033	930	3560	3204
1972	1738	1564	5984	5386
1973	1700	1530	5853	5268
1974	1298	1168	4469	4022
1975	1074	967	3702	3332
1976	1084	976	3593	3234
1977	849	764	2857	2571
1978	672	605	2283	2055
1979	942	848	3201	2881
1980	941	847	3187	2868
1981	786	707	2587	2328

[1] Data for 1970-1975 are for MINITEX Network only. Total requests are reported only for MINITEX. Total ILL was split based on an estimated 22.5% for Photocopies and 77.5% for Books. Request values are based on a 90% reported hit rate.

Table 2

Total Requests to
St. Olaf College Library
From Other Libraries

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled	Req	Filled
1975	NA	35	NA	184
1976	NA	66	NA	NA
1977	NA	189	NA	12
1978	NA	250	NA	245
1979	NA	282	NA	89
1980	NA	425	NA	101
1981	NA	489	NA	73

Ithaca College: The Library

Ithaca College (IC) was founded in 1897 as the Ithaca Conservatory of Music, and has maintained a well-deserved reputation for excellence in the performing arts programs ever since. In addition to music, theatre arts and communications, Ithaca College's program strengths include physical education and a recently established business program. The character of IC is very much that of a resident undergraduate college; enrollment in 1980-81 number 4,641 full-time undergraduates, 67 part-time undergraduates, and 148 full-time and part-time graduates.[67]

The curricular emphases are reflected in the library collections, which are very strong in music, physical education and communications. The library has a fulltime professional staff of eight; support staff number about ten.

Ithaca College is a very active member of the South Central Research Library Council, through which a good portion of IC's in-state interlibrary loan traffic is channeled. Interlibrary Loan librarians at Ithaca College have served on SCRLC's ILL Committee during most of the last decade, in part because of IC's reputation within the SCRLC lending area as a reliable and fast source of loans.

IC's library contains the following collections:

Book Titles	161,434
Book Volumes	267,260
Periodical Subscriptions	1,773
Microforms	15,449
Sound Recordings	8,987

Sound Tapes 1,018[68]

According to Everett Morse, Head of Interlibrary Loan at Ithaca College's Library, the implementation of OCLC at IC has had "a tremendous impact" on interlibrary loan requests to the IC Library, and on the processing procedures at the library. The Interlibrary Loan department began using OCLC as a searching and location tool immediately upon its arrival at IC, and have continued to search routinely the OCLC data base prior to any other verification tool. Before the implementation of the OCLC ILL subsystem in January of 1982, searching OCLC served the purpose of almost all requests from IC patrons; the vehicle for transmitting the requests was most frequently the standard American Library Association form.

About a decade ago Ithaca College Library's interlibrary loans to other libraries exceeded for the first time their requests for materials, a trend which stabilized over the intervening years. The pattern is even more pronounced since the implementation of OCLC first as a searching tool and then as a specific ILL program. Shortly after the OCLC terminal was installed at IC, it was noted by the Interlibrary Loan librarian that "OCLC will play an increasingly significant role in interlibrary loan."[69] By the time the subsystem was in place the majority of IC's interlibrary loan traffic was in filling requests for other libraries, and loan requests had doubled from the previous year. Said Morse, "I expect this is mainly due to our fine collection of items and also to the OCLC Interlibrary Loan subsystem which makes requests on verifications and sources

of material so readily available to all."[70] But IC had not abandoned the ALA form for their own requests; due to the small number of requests by IC patrons, the staff found it more economically appropriate to send requests by mail.

The Interlibrary Loan staff, which consists of Mr. Morse and a reference assistant whose duties include interlibrary loan, are pleased with the OCLC subsystem because of its ease of use and immediacy of results. Patron use of Interlibrary Loan services has not met the staff's expectations; they hope to launch a publicity campaign to inform users of the advantages of interlibrary lending of materials from a potentially nationwide range of resources.

The data supplied by Ithaca College indicates that other libraries have discovered IC's range of resources: while Table 1 indicates some lack of interest in the ILL program on the part of IC users, the increase in requests made to IC from other libraries as noted in Table 2 is dramatic. The lack of growth in interlibrary borrowing by IC is also due in part to the same reason that lending to other institutions has increased: the quality of IC's collections in specific fields such as music, communications and physical education.

Although the data contained in Table 3 indicates little change in terms of IC's use of the SCRLC for requests compared to requesting from other libraries, Table 4 indicates a much greater rate of increase in requests to IC from libraries outside the network. This will likely continue for IC as for other libraries as the OCLC ILL Subsystem is implemented more and more frequently.

Table 1

Total Requests by

Ithaca College Library

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled	Req	Filled
1973	124 [1]	NA	403 [1]	NA
1974	181	NA	305	NA
1975	154	NA	286	NA
1976	169	NA	297	NA
1977	95	NA	165	NA
1978	110	NA	171	NA
1979	105	NA	151	NA
1980	152	NA	84	NA

[1] Records kept only according to number of transmissions made

Table 2

Total Requests to
Ithaca College Library
From Other Libraries

Year	Books		Photocopies	
	Req	Filled	Req	Filled
1973	170	NA[1]	168	NA
1974	177	NA	420	NA
1975	133	NA	404	NA
1976	138	NA	419	NA
1977	192	NA	441	NA
1978	168	NA	398	NA
1979	556	NA	703	NA
1980	518	NA	692	NA

[1] No data available on requests filled

Table 3

Total Requests by

Ithaca College Library

Year	Through Cooperatives				Through Special Services				To Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F	R	F
1973	66	NA	308	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	58	NA	95	NA
1974	124	NA	285	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	57	NA	20	NA
1975	99	NA	278	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	55	NA	8	NA
1976	110	NA	286	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	59	NA	11	NA
1977	16	NA	108	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	79	NA	57	NA
1978	29	NA	121	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	81	NA	50	NA
1979	23	NA	96	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	53	NA	47	NA
1980	58	NA	51	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	88	NA	33	NA

Table 4

Total Requests to

Ithaca College Library

Year	Through Cooperatives				From Other Libraries			
	Books		Photo		Books		Photo	
	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill	Req	Fill
1973	162	NA	159	NA	8	NA	9	NA
1974	161	NA	414	NA	15	NA	6	NA
1975	102	NA	410	NA	31	NA	3	NA
1976	104	NA	416	NA	34	NA	3	NA
1977	141	NA	412	NA	51	NA	29	NA
1978	95	NA	359	NA	73	NA	39	NA
1979	204	NA	588	NA	352	NA	115	NA
1980	189	NA	554	NA	329	NA	138	NA

Summary

Considering that the body of information reviewed here is based upon the experiences of only six academic libraries, it is interesting that several patterns of development and use have emerged. Some of the factors which these libraries have in common are

•Membership and participation in the services of a bibliographic utility (OCLC or RLIN) have had a decided impact upon the interlibrary loan services at each institution.

•In all cases, materials requested of the participating library increased in quantity; in most cases, their ability to fill those requests also increased. This seems to indicate a general increase in ILL traffic among libraries who share the bibliographic data bases of the major utilities.

•Although at each library requests received and sent were more national in scope, the preponderance of interlibrary lending took place locally or regionally. Patterns of borrowing and lending still reflect long-standing cooperative arrangements which preceded membership in OCLC or RLIN.

•New categories of use or patterns of ILL traffic have caused some obsolescence in the reporting procedures for interlibrary loan. In most libraries reporting procedures answered the need for information for local decision-making only.

•Staffing for new patterns of interlibrary lending traffic, and the demands placed on the staff in terms of knowledge and skills were issues at several of the participating libraries.

Some differences were also evident:

•Emphasis on the value of the interlibrary loan program and patrons' expectations varied greatly from library to library.

•Recordkeeping and the availability of background information on a library's cooperative activities were also different from library to library. Although the bibliographic utilities can supply general figures for each library's ILL activity, the libraries reviewed here have not applied this information to their own reporting routines.

It is clear from the interest generated by this topic among librarians at the participating libraries and at other institutions that definitive work in this area would clarify for network and bibliographic utility users the advantages and disadvantages of participation in the network environment. It would also be valuable to compare the responses of this group of libraries to experiences of other college and research libraries.

ISSUES FOR THE FUTURE

Academic libraries have become accustomed to and proficient in the application of telecommunications technology to address the issues of resource sharing and collection development. "If the network nation will soon be upon us, then it is extraordinarily fortunate that the library field has already achieved a position in the leading edge of networking. It is absolutely critical that we expend our talent, energy, and resources wisely to maintain this lead and to advance even more rapidly. No other aspect of library development is as important for the next decade."[71] The next decade has arrived, and the role of the bibliographic utilities in relation to the interlibrary networks and their future is still undefined in any conscious way. At the local level, the notion of a planned and supervised National Interlibrary Loan Network conjures up images of an additional layer of acronymic bureaucracy over the already existing network of networks which serve their libraries' various needs. A certain superficiality characterizes the idea of a planned national network of library cooperation. The librarians who work on a daily basis with interlibrary loan traffic throughout the country are aware that

"...a defacto, uncoordinated national ILL network exists; this network functions reasonably well but can be improved; (and) these improvement can be made through existing institutions..."[72] These existing institutions include the major bibliographic utilities, the regional network service centers, state library agencies and local or special-member

consortia. By virtue of their size and capabilities, the bibliographic utilities will doubtless be at the forefront of any improvements in interlibrary access and communication. But the growth and in interlibrary access and communication. The project funded by the Council on Library Resources which is currently working on establishing telecommunication links and shared data bases among the utilities may become a vehicle for establishing standards for information and resource sharing.

Even as the bibliographic utilities develop more advanced technology to meet their members' needs, computer technology will become increasingly available to smaller groups of libraries and to individual libraries as well. "This distribution of computing capability will be made possible by the rapidly increasing power and declining cost of dependable and transferable network software systems."[73] It is unlikely that more accessible and more powerful computer technology will cause a major exodus from the bibliographic utilities, but libraries and groups of libraries may find it more cost effective to perform locally some tasks which are currently conducted by the utilities.

For the library user, access to material he or she needs is the purpose of the library; if the needs of the library user are indeed the most important considerations in determining library priorities, then the enhancement of the most effective interlibrary communications system possible would be a priority. The reconciling of local and regional systems and procedures would be a next logical step. This integration of diverse networks will demand creative attention to a variety of issues:

"-the integration of local or regional records...into the network database;

--the integration of serial records of individual libraries into the network database;

--the integration of online services with network services...;

--the resolution of relationships between national lending libraries...and the present network structures," among others.[74]

An issue of obvious concern is the lack of standardization for compiling and reporting information about the state of interlibrary lending, one of the two major activities upon which a "national network" would be based. Conclusions about the condition of interlibrary cooperation of any kind are very difficult to reach, because most libraries keep records for local purposes only, as they did before their membership in and use of bibliographic utility programs. Understanding and support of the necessity of resource sharing will be achieved only by demonstrating its value and effectivenesss. Identifying the organization or organizations that might take responsibility for devising pertinent standardized reporting routines, and some incentive for applying them, is a difficult task which should nevertheless be discussed by concerned segments of the "national network". The present cooperation among the Library of Congress, RLG, WLN, and OCLC to a lesser extent, is a positive sign for those concerned with the future of national resource sharing. It is important to keep in mind, though, that the purpose of the

bibliographic utiliites is to serve the needs of the nation's libraries better than the libraries themselves can. It is evident that the utilities have filled this role thus far; it is hoped that current plans and programs are developed with this in mind. To date, little research has been made available on the mutual impact of interlibrary loan programs and the bibliographic utilities to determine if developing patterns indicate a national network in practice as well as in theory. It is suggested that such a study, undertaken through a bibliographic utility or through a national library organization, could yield important information for those considering the future of a national resource sharing network.

NOTES

1. DeGennaro in Markuson, p.304

2. Stevens in Markuson, p.35

3. "Understanding the Utilities", p.262

4. ibid., p.263-4

5. "OCLC is Not a Dinosaur, But will Set Pace", p.493-4

6. Epstein in Markuson, p. 121

7. Discussion with Philip Schieber, Director of Public Information, OCLC Inc., Dublin OH, May 13, 1982

8. ibid.

9. OCLC Newsletter 3/82, p. 1

10. ibid., p. 1

11. Discussion with Barbara Brown, Program Coordinator for Shared Resources, RLG Inc., May 14, 1982.

12. Robinson in Markuson, p. 255

13. ibid., p. 255

14. Jacobs: On Line Reсource Sharing II, p. 50

15. Discussion with Barbara Brown, RLG Inc.

16. Hewitt, p. 16

17. ibid., p. 28-9

18. Jacobs., op.cit., p. 24

19. ibid., p. 39

20. Discussion with Philip Schieber, May 17, 1982

21. Discussion with Barbara Brown, May 14, 1

22. ibid.

23. ibid.

24. Jacobs, op.cit., p. 50

25. "BC Moves to Stanford", p. 410

26. Discussion with Barbara Brown, May 14, 1982

27. ibid.

28. College Blue Book 1980-81, p.947

29. Indiana State University Library Annual Report 1979-80, p.12

30. Indiana State University Library Annual Report 1976-7, p.4

31. op.cit., Annual Report 1979-80, p. 7

32. op.cit., Annual Report 1976-7, p. 6

33. Indiana State University Library Annual Report 1979-80, p. 8

34. Discussion with Mary Ann Phillips, Indiana State University Interlibrary Loan Staff, May 17, 1982

35. ibid.

36. ibid.

37. ibid.

38. The College Handbook 1981-2, p.370

39. American Library Directory 1981-82.

40. Information from Librarian's Office, Cornell University.

41. ibid.

42. Discussions with Patricia Schafer, Head of Interlibrary Loan Services, Cornell University, February 1982, June 1982

43-48. ibid.

49. The College Blue Book 1981-82,

50. American Library Directory 1981-2.

51. ibid.

52. Discussions with Arthur H. Miller Jr., Director of the Libraries, Lake Forest College, January 1982, March 1982.

53. Lake Forest College Library Annual Report of Statistics, 1974-5.

54. Discussions with Arthur H. Miller Jr., March 1982.

55. The College Handbook, 1981-82.

56. GW in Brief (Pamphlet).

57. A Composite Report of Library Statistics 1980-81, p. 3,-5

58. Discussions with Martha Bowman, Associate University Librarian, George Washington University, January 1982, April 1982.

59. Discussions with Joan Lippincott, Head of Reference, George Washington University Library, May 1982, June 1982.

60-62. ibid.

63. Correspondence with St. Olaf ILL staff.

64-66. ibid.

67. Ithaca College Library Annual Report of Interlibrary Loan 1975-6, p.2

68. Ithaca College Library Annual Report of Interlibrary Loan, 1979-80, p. 3

69. Ithaca College Library Annual Report of Interlibrary Loan, 1974-5, p. 2

70. op. cit., Annual Report 1979-80, p. 3

71. Markuson, p. 27

72. Jacobs, Mary Ellen. "National Interlibrary Loan Network", p. 24

73. DeGennaro in Markuson, p. 307-8

74. Stevens, Norman. "Library Networks and Resource Sharing", p. 409

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Library Association. Association of College and Research Libraries. New Horizons for Academic Libraries. Chicago: ALA, 1979.

American Library Directory, 34th edition. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1981.

Battin, Patricia M. "Research Libraries in the Network Environment: The Case for Cooperation." Journal of Academic Librarianship 6:68-73, 5/80.

Branscomb, Lewis and A. Robert Rogers. "The Conception and Birth Pangs of OCLC." College and Research Libraries 42:403-4, 11/80.

Buckland, L.F. and W.L. Basinski. The Role of the Library of Congress in the Evolving National Network: A Study Commissioned by The LC Network Development Office. Washington, D.C.: Library of Congress, 1978.

"Cost Study of OCLC/ILL in Florida." Library Journal 106:498, 3/1/81.

Crawford, S.Y. and B. Markuson, eds. "Perspectives on: Library Networks and Reseource Sharing." American Society for Information Science Journal 31:403-:4, 11/80.

DeGennaro, Richard. "Resource Sharing in a Network Environment." Library Journal 105:353-5, 2/1/80.

Dougherty, Richard M. "OCLC: Commemorating A Decade of Accomplishment, Preparing for a Decade of Challenge." Journal of Academic Librarianship 8:1, 3/82.

"GW in Brief." Pamphlet issued by George Washington University.

George Washington University. Gelman Library. Annual Composite Report of Library Statistics. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, The Library. 1978-1981.

George Washington University. Gelman Library. Annual Interlibrary Loan Report, 1978-81. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, The Library.

Hewitt, Joe A. OCLC: Impact and Use. Ohio State University Libraries, 197[illegible].

Indiana State University. Cunningham Memorial Library. Annual Report, 1976-1981. Terre Haute: Indiana State University, The Library.

Ithaca College. Library. Annual ILL Reports, 1969-81. Ithaca, New York: The College Library.

Jacobs, Mary Ellen. "National Interlibrary Loan Network: the OCLC Approach." ASIS Bulletin 5:24-5, 6/79.

Jacobs, Mary Ellen. On-line Resource Sharing II: A Comparison of OCLC, Inc., Research Libraries Information Network, and Washington Library Network. Susan K. Martin, ed. 2d ed. San Jose: CLASS, 1979.

Kallenbach, Susan and Susan Jacobson. "Staff Response to Changing Systems: From Manual to OCLC to RLIN." Journal of Academic Librarianship 6:264-7, 11/80.

Kilgour, Frederick G. "Interlibrary Loans On-Line." Library Journal 104:460-3, 2/15/79.

Lake Forest College. Library. Annual ILL Report, 1974-81. Lake Forest, IL: The College Library.

Markuson, Barbara and Blanche Woolls, eds. Networks for Networkers: Critical Issues in Cooperative Library Development. NY: Neal-Schumann, 1980.

Martin, Susan K. Library Networks, 1979-80. White Plains: Knowledge Industry Publs., 1981.

Martin, Susan K. "Library Networking in the U.S., 1981." In The Bowker Annual of Library and Book Trade Information. 27th ed. New York: R.R. Bowker, 1982.

Matheson, Maureen, ed. The College Handbook, 1981-2. NY: College Entrance Examination Board, 1981.

Matthews, Joseph. "The Four Online Bibliographic Utilites: A Comparison." Library Technology Reports 15:665-838, 11/79.

"Network Link Nixed by OCLC". Library Journal 106:410, 2/15/81.

"OCLC and SOLINET Explore Collaboration." Wilson Library Bulletin 55:571, 4/81.

OCLC, Inc. Newsletter. Various Issues.

"OCLC Is Not a Dinosaur." Library Journal 107:493-4, 3/1/82.

"OCLC Subsystem Gets Credit for Shifting ILL Burden." Library Journal 104:2397+, 11/15/79.

"OCLC's Subsystem Logs Millionth Request." Library Journal 106:460-3, 2/15/79.

"OCLC Users Appraise ILL Subsystem." Library Journal 105:767-9, 4/1/80.

Palmour, Vernon E. and Nancy K. Roderer. "Library Resource Sharing Through Networks." In Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, v.13, 1978. White Plains: Knowledge Industry Publs.

Research Libraries Group, Inc. 1980: The Year in Review. Stanford, CA., The Research Libraries Group, Inc. 1981.

"RLG and UTLAS Agree to Cooperate." Wilson Library Bulletin 55:571, 4/81.

"RLG, WLN, LC Receive CLR Grants for Authority Control." Law Library Journal 73:750-1, Summer 1980.

Robinson, Barbara M. "Cooperation and Competition among Library Networks." American Society for Information Science Journal 31:413-24, 11/80.

Rouse, William B. and Sandra H. Rouse. "Assessing the Impact of Computer Technology on the Performance of Interlibrary Loan Networks." American Society for Information Science Journal 28:79-88, 3/77.

Stevens, Norman and James Rush. "Issues Relative to the Role of State and Multi-State Networks in the Evolving Nationwide Bibliographic Network." Draft Typescript. Washington, D.C.: Prepared for Council on Library Resources, 4/81.

Stevens, Norman. "Library Networks and Resource Sharing in the U.S.: An Historical and Philosophical Overview." American Society for Information Science Journal 31:405-12, 11/80.

"Understanding the Utilities: A Special Current Awareness Presentation." American Libraries 11:262-79, 5/80.

U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics. Library Statistics of Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: NCES, 1979.

Webster, John K. and C.L. Warden. "Comparing the Bibliographic Utilities for Special Libraries." Special Libraries 71:519-22, 12/80.

Yearbook of Higher Education, 1981-82. 13th ed. Chicago: Marquis Academic Media, 1982.